

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-4 and 11-14 were amended. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

Claim 13 was objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependant form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. The Examiner suggested making claim 13 depend from claim 11 instead of claim 12. Accordingly, claim 13 has been so amended to depend from claim 11.

Claims 1-5 and 11-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by *Genrich* (US Patent 6,055,280). Claims 6-10 and 16-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Genrich* (US Patent 6,055,280) in view of *Hale* (US Patent 5,572,349). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

The Examiner admits that “*Genrich* fails to disclose a demultiplexor circuit having N shift registers.” In addition, *Hale* fails to teach or suggest the use of shift registers as currently claimed. Specifically, each independent claim (1, 7, 11, and 17) recites partitioning or demultiplexing each modulated signal into N shift registers (i.e. *from* the partitioning means or multiplexer *to* the shift register). Support for this feature may be found in exemplary paragraphs [7, 21, 24, and 26] of the present specification.

The Examiner indicates that *Hale* teaches the use of shift registers in figure 6 and at column 7, lines 6-19. Although *Hale* does discuss the use of shift registers, *Hale* fails to teach partitioning or demultiplexing modulated signals into shift registers. Instead, *Hale* teaches that the shift register receives the data signal from a “superframed data input” (i.e., not from a partitioning means or a demultiplexer), and that the shift register supplies the signals to the decoder (i.e. from the shift register to the decoder). This is the opposite of and teaches away from the claimed invention.

Because the prior art fails to teach or suggest this limitation, Applicant submits that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and §103(a) are improper and should be withdrawn.

In light of the above remarks, Applicant submit that claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

BY  7-14-05

Craig L. Plastrik
Reg. No. 41,254
Hughes Network Systems, LLC
Customer No. 29190

Dated: July ~~14~~¹⁴, 2005